UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,589	01/30/2004	John M. Koegler	200313829-1	8582

22879 7590 03/14/2007

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
ROY, SIKHA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2879	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/769,589	KOEGLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sikha Roy	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 December 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,23-30 and 35-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,23-30 and 35-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 January 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The Amendment, filed on December 14, 2006 has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Claims 1-9,23-30 and 35-40 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,505,958 to Ooms et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,010,455 to Luallin et al.

Regarding claim 1 Ooms discloses (Fig. 2 column 1 lines 35-37, column 4 lines 15-34) a reflector assembly for use in projection purpose comprising a reflector 2 including a reflector opening, a startup element (starting aid) 31 permanently coupled (through a connection conductor 34 which passes through a opening 35 and connected to the contact member 29 provided on the reflector) to the reflector 2 wherein the reflector and the startup element are coupled to a lamp 10.

Ooms fails to disclose the replaceable coupling of the lamp assembly.

Luallin in the same field of endeavor discloses (Fig. 1 column 2 lines 7-31) a headlamp including a plastic parabolic reflecting surface 12 with an opening 14 for

receiving the light bulb 22 of a replaceable light bulb assembly. It is to be noted that replaceable lamp assembly provides the benefit of replacing a fused light bulb which can no longer be used without replacing the reflector and the lamp assembly. This results in reducing the manufacturing cost.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the lamp assembly of Ooms by a replaceably coupled lamp assembly to the reflector as taught by Luallin for the benefit of replacing a fused light bulb which can no longer be used without replacing the reflector and the lamp assembly and thus reducing the manufacturing cost.

Regarding claim 2 Ooms discloses the startup element comprises a coil 33 (antenna 33 is wound few turns around).

Regarding claim 4, Ooms discloses the lamp assembly further comprises a potential coupler 34 (current conductor) configured to couple the startup element to a potential source.

Regarding claim 5 Ooms discloses (Fig. 2 column 4 lines 30-34) a structural element 34 (the potential coupler) coupled to the reflector 2 and the startup element where the potential coupler 34 runs along the structural element.

Regarding claim 6 Ooms discloses the potential coupler 34 comprising a structural element for supporting the startup element.

Regarding claim 7 Luallin discloses (Fig. 1 column 2 lines 49-67 column 3 lines 1-15) a latching assembly (retainer) 18 to engage the lamp header 26 of the lamp assembly.

Regarding claim 8 Ooms discloses (Fig. 2 column 3 lines 41-45) the reflector comprises a parabolic (paraboloidally curved) reflector.

Regarding claim 23 Ooms and Luallin disclose the method of forming a reflector assembly comprising affixing a startup element 33 to a reflector 2, such that the start-up element is supported at a predetermined location within the reflector and coupling a latching assembly 18 to the opening defined in the reflector wherein the startup element and the latching assembly cooperate to allow replaceable coupling of a lamp to the reflector assembly. Ooms and Luallin do not exemplify affixing the start up element in the reflector prior to coupling the lamp assembly. The lamp assembly being a replaceable one it is the position of the Examiner that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to fix the startup element within the reflector and form the reflector assembly prior to forming the replaceable lamp assembly. This configuration would result in easy replacement of the lamp at any time.

Regarding claim 24 Ooms and Luallin disclose the startup element comprises a startup coil 33.

Regarding claim 25 Ooms and Luallin disclose the method further comprises coupling a wire 34 to the startup element wherein the conducting wire is configured to couple the startup element 33 to a potential source.

Regarding claim 26 Ooms and Luallin disclose the method comprises coupling a structural element 35 to the reflector 2 for supporting the startup element wherein the wire 34 runs along the structural element 35.

Regarding claim 27 Ooms disclose the wire comprising a structural element configured to support the startup element.

Regarding claim 28 Ooms and Luallin disclose the latching assembly is configured to engage a lamp header of the lamp assembly.

Regarding claim 29 Ooms and Luallin disclose the reflector comprises a parabolic reflector.

Regarding claim 35 Ooms and Luallin disclose all the limitations same as of claim 1 and furthermore Ooms discloses a support structure 34, separate from the lamp assembly for fixedly coupling the start up element 31 to the reflector 2, so that the start up element is supported within the reflector.

Regarding claim 36 Ooms discloses the start up element comprises a coil 33.

Regarding claims 38 and 40 Ooms discloses the support structure comprises a potential coupler 34 (current conductor) configured to couple the startup element to a potential source.

Claims 3, 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,505,958 to Ooms et al. U.S. Patent 5,010,455 to Luallin et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent 3,733,599 to Fantozzi.

Claim 3 differs from Ooms and Luallin in that Ooms and Luallin do not exemplify the startup element comprising a shield.

Fantozzi in analogous art of triggering a flash lamp discloses (Fig. 2 column 1 lines 66 through column 2 line 3, column 3 lines 51-62) a startup element comprising a shield 25 (conductive member having curved surface area) used as startup (triggering) element. Fantozzi further notes that this design of the startup element reduces the amplitude of voltage required for starting the lamp and hence reduces temperature build-up in the bulb envelope.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to substitute the coil startup element of Ooms and Luallin by a shield type startup element as taught by Fantozzi for reducing the amplitude of voltage required for starting the lamp and hence reducing temperature build-up in the bulb envelope.

Claim 37 essentially recites the same limitation as claim 3 and hence is rejected for the same reason.

Claims 9 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,505,958 to Ooms et al. U.S. Patent 5,010,455 to Luallin et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,078,128 for Gagnon et al.

Regarding claim 9 Ooms and Luallin do not disclose the reflector being elliptical.

Gagnon in pertinent art discloses (Fig. 1 column 2 21-26) the lamp housing 12 comprises reflective parabolic, elliptical forms, well known in the lamp art.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an elliptic reflector for the lamp assembly of Ooms and Luallin as suggested by Gagnon based on its suitability in the application, the parabolic reflectors being well known in the art.

Claim 30 essentially recites the same limitation as of claim 9 and hence is rejected for the same reason.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,505,958 to Ooms et al. U.S. Patent 5,010,455 to Luallin et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,213,170 to Kimball et al.

Regarding claim 39 Ooms and Luallin do not exemplify support structure comprising a rod and potential coupler comprising a wire running along the rod.

Kimball in analogous art of reflector lamp discloses (Figs. 1,2 column 1 lines 21-30) a lamp is supported in a reflector by support rods 3 which are connected to the lead-in wires 4 and the reflector. It is noted that the support rods support the lamp structure within the reflector. Although Kimball does not exemplify the wire running along the rod it is well known in the art to have the wire guided through the rod for preventing any breakage and exposing the wire to surrounding.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the support structure of Ooms and Luallin by a support rod fixedly coupled to the reflector for supporting the starting element within the reflector as suggested by Kimball and the potential coupler passing through the rod for providing protection for the potential coupling wire.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 14, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Ooms does not disclose the starting element 33 permanently coupled to the reflector the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Ooms discloses that the startup element is connected to a conduction wire 34 which passes through an opening in the reflector 2 and is fixed with the contact member 29 provided on the surface of the reflector. This configuration indeed provides permanent coupling (fixed linking or permanent connection) of the starting aid with the reflector.

In response to applicant's allegation that Ooms does not teach or suggest the startup element that is part of the reflector assembly, the Examiner disagrees. Ooms discloses (column 6 claim 9) the reflector unit being provided with a starting aid, the starting aid being connected to the further contact member, provided on the outer surface of the reflector.

Referring to claim 23 the applicant alleges that Ooms and Luallin do not teach the antenna supported within the reflector at a predetermined location, the Examiner disagrees. Ooms and Luallin disclose the method of forming a reflector assembly comprising affixing a startup element 33 to a reflector 2, such that the start-up element is supported at a predetermined location within the reflector and coupling a latching assembly 18 to the opening defined in the reflector wherein the startup element and the latching assembly cooperate to allow replaceable coupling of a lamp to the reflector

assembly. Ooms and Luallin do not explicitly disclose affixing the start up element in the reflector prior to coupling the lamp assembly. The lamp assembly being a replaceable one it is the position of the Examiner that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to fix the startup element within the reflector and form the reflector assembly prior to forming the replaceable lamp assembly. This configuration would result in easy replacement of the lamp at any time.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent 4,774,645 to Iwamoto discloses a replaceable lamp assembly. U.S. Patent 5,497,299 to Wisler et al. and U.S. Patent 6,776,515 to Schmitt disclose a bulb shield on the lamp permanently fixed to the reflector.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sikha Roy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sikha Roy

Sikha Roy
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879